DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 037 08 CE 017 480

AUTHOR Bigney, Tracy B.
TITLE The Bilingual Human Services Educational Consortium of Bangor Community College. Third Year Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Maine Univ., Orono. Social Science Research Inst.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 31 Jul 78
NOTE 44p.; For a related document see CE 017 481

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; Adult Vocational Education; *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Students; Certification; College Faculty; Community Colleges; Community Services; Consortia; Course Evaluation; Educational Environment; English (Second Language); *Gerontology; *Human Services; Post Secondary Education; Practicums; Program Attitudes; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Student Opinion; Summative Evaluation; Supervisors; Underemployed; Unemployed; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Franco Americans

ABSTRACT

This third-party evaluation report, presented in six sections, begins with an introductory section on the procedures used to evaluate the Bilingual Human Services Educational Consortium. (The consortium, a one-year college level program, prepares underemployed and unemployed Franco-Americans for paraprofessional human service jobs.) Also described in the introduction is the summative evaluation design based on program participants' attitudes as assessed through questionnaires, interviews, and observations. In section 2 findings on students' perspectives are presented. In section 3 the faculty perspective is examined and in section 4 the practicum supervisor's perspective is investigated. In the fifth section, seventeen observations and recommendations resulting from site visits are presented in four categories: providing University access for non-traditional students, program atmosphere, vocational training, and academic considerations. The final section presents the results of each program objective: (1) to expand the bilingual certificate gerontology program, (2 and 3) to provide bilingual vocational education for Maine's high Franco-American populations and 100 unemployed and underemployed adults, and (4) to encourage consortia between the University of Maine system and community agencies in meeting the above objectives. The report concludes that the first three objectives were met, and the fourth was partially fulfilled. (See related document CE 017 481 which contains a comprehensive report of all project activities.) (CSS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

- ED158037

The Bilingual Human Services Educational Consortium of Bangor Community College

Third Year Evaluation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared by

Tracy B. Bigney
Social Science Research Institute
University of Maine
Orono, Maine

July 31, 1978

CE 017 480

CONTENTS

I. Introduction

II. The Program from the Students' Perspective

III. The Program from the Faculty Perspective

IV. The Program from the Practicum Supervisors' Perspective

V. Site Visit Observations and Recommendations

VI. Conclusion

I. INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 1977, The Bilingual Human Services Educational Consortium (also called the Franco-American Human Services Program) of Bangor Community College contracted with the Social Science Research Institute (SSRI) to perform a third party evaluation of the Consortium's third year of operation.[1] The Consortium is a one-year college level training program to prepare underemployed and unemployed Franco-Americans for paraprofessional jobs in human services. The Consortium has just completed its third and final year of funding from the United States Office of Education's Bilingual Vocational Training Program.

The evaluation addresses several issues. First, did the Consortium meet the objectives put forward in the grant proposal? Second, were the students who were recruited drawn from the target group defined in the proposal? Third, what were the Program's effects or outcomes as seen by students, faculty, staff, and practicum supervisors? Fourth, how smoothly did the Program operate; what were its operational strengths and weaknesses? Fifth, what recommendations can we make for similar projects? That is, what do we learn from the Consortium as a model for bilingual education, for vocational education, for adult education, and for inter-campus or inter-institutional consortia?

Two persons were primarily responsible for conducting the evaluation. Tracy Bigney, Assistant Director for Field Operations of SSRI had overall responsibility for managing both the survey research and site visit elements of the study. Ms. Bigney has conducted a number of program evaluations and worked extensively in survey research. She was a member of the Consortium's evaluation team for the 1975-76 year. Clayton Pinette, Chairperson of Developmental Studies for Bangor Community College, served as the second member of the site visit team. Mr. Pinette is a bilingual Franco-American. His Franco-American heritage, his experience teaching in a community college, and his expertise in developmental education made him uniquely qualified to participate in the evaluation. In

---

[1]Footnotes will be found at the end of the section.

addition, Mr. Pinette was an instructor at the Bangor site of the Consortium during the 1976-77 year, so he was familiar with the projects' goals and operations.

The objectives stated in the Consortium's proposal for the 1977-78 year were summarized as follows:

1. To expand the scope of the current bilingual certificate program in gerontology, adding courses from the associate degree program options in: chemical addiction counseling, mental health, developmental disabilities.

2. To expand the geographic area served by the current project to include the Augusta-Waterville region making bilingual vocational education available in all areas of Maine with high Franco-American populations.

3. To provide bilingual vocational preparation to an additional one hundred unemployed and underemployed Franco-American adults, enhancing their employability for positions in social service agencies in their home communities.

4. To encourage an on-going consortium among the University of Maine system and cooperating community agencies that will respond to the continuing need for bilingual vocational education in Maine.[2]

In addition, the Consortium anticipated as "significant new benefits" of the projects' third year of funding:

1. Additional trained bilingual workers will be available for employment in a wide range of human service-related occupations.

2. Program graduates will have access to entry-level human service positions or to further educational preparation and credentialling. It is anticipated that by June, 1978, the program will have contributed to the presence of approximately 200 trained bilingual workers in human service jobs in Maine.

3. Increased institutional awareness of the employment and educational needs of Franco-Americans will promote the continuation of specialized services to meet their needs.

4. A broad vocational curriculum and wider area served will encourage identification and utilization of additional community and institutional resources.

5. Increased institutional cost sharing at the five participating campuses will serve as a cost-effective model for institutionalizing programs within the university system.

6. Improved educational access and supportive learning environments for new student programs will be encouraged for Franco-Americans and others not traditionally served.[3]

Methodology

The evaluation design was constrained by time and budgetary limitations: it was to be an evaluation chiefly of the Consortium's third year, not all three years; it could not assess students' job placement six months, a year, or more after they completed the program; it could not employ an experimental design with applicants randomly assigned to 'treatment' and 'control' groups. The evaluation design agreed upon by the Consortium and SSRI is best described as (1) summative rather than formative; (2) based on attitudes held by program participants rather than on cost-effectiveness or quantitative program outcomes (such as placement rates or scores on vocational skill or language tests); and (3) employing several methods of data collection, including questionnaires (using both one-time and pre- and post-measures), interviews, group interviews, and observation. The evaluation consisted of two major components: self-administered questionnaires completed by project participants, and site visits.

Questionnaires

The questionnaires employed varied in content and time of administration for three sub-groups of participants. All questionnaires were designed by SSRI in consultation with Consortium Director Dr. Michael Beaudoin, drawing on questionnaires used in the two prior evaluations.[4] Questionnaires were distributed by site coordinators or by mail. They were returned by mail directly to SSRI, so that Consortium staff had no way of identifying how--or whether--any individual responded.

Students were asked to complete two questionnaires; one in October soon after the program started and a second in May as they were completing the program. The fall questionnaire included questions on students' backgrounds, use of the French language, evaluation of the program to date, self-concept and self-confidence, and attitudes towards the roles of men and women. The spring questionnaire

repeated, either verbatim or slightly modified, all questions except those on personal backgrounds, and in addition, asked a series of questions about the effectiveness of the program's language development aspects and questions about the practicum placement. These added questions were not considered appropriate for the fall questionnaire.

The reason for including items on students' self-concept, self-confidence, and perception of sex roles may not be immediately apparent. While the program's goals are to provide language and vocational development, its effects on students attitudes toward themselves and their cultural group are relevant. Dr. James Gallagher, evaluator of the Consortium program for 1976-77 explained:

> It is clear from the formal literature as well as personal experience that low self-esteem is characteristic of many Franco-Americans in Maine. The causes of this pattern are tied to both language and general attitudes toward Franco-Americans in the state. Although it is not within the purpose of this evaluation to discuss the origins and distribution of this pattern, it is clear that its presence is a significant barrier to Franco-American employment. Therefore, any training program must overcome the barrier.[5]

Response to the student questionnaire was excellent. In both the spring and fall, questionnaires were sent to 110 students and a second questionnaire was sent to non-respondents. The fall questionnaire was completed by 104 students, or 95%. The spring response rate was considerably lower (76%), but still very good.

Faculty at each consortium site received questionnaires at the end of each semester. Site coordinators all served as faculty members as well, so that they were included in the faculty sub-group. Most instructors were involved in the program for only one of the two semesters. However, those who taught for the entire year were asked to complete questionnaires at the end of each semester. Of the forty-five questionnaires distributed, forty-one were received completed. This 91% response indicates excellent faculty cooperation and assures that the responses well represent the Program faculty as a whole. Principal topics included in the faculty questionnaire were bilingual instruction, curriculum,

the University setting, student preparation, Program outcomes, and Program administration.

Practicum supervisors--employees of human service agencies who were responsible for supervising students placed in their agencies for practicum experiences--were sent questionnaires at the end of the second semester. (All practicum placements occurred during the second semester.) Because many agencies served as placements for several students the total number of supervisors was fifty-four. Of these, thirty (56%) responded. Supervisors were asked about the students' preparation and performance, communications with the site coordinator, impact on the agency's clients, and the need for bilingual human service paraprofessionals.

Site Visits

The site visit team, comprised of Ms. Bigney and Mr. Pinette, spent one full day at each of the five instructional sites and conducted several interviews at Bangor Community College where the Consortium was administered. At each site we talked to students, faculty, a few practicum supervisors, University administrators, and staff. Students were interviewed as a group; faculty either in groups or individually; and practicum administrators, staff, and University administrators were interviewed individually. Interviews were not highly structured, but an outline was developed and used at all sites. Thus we ensured that comparable information was collected at all sites and that the interview format was flexible enough to adapt to each situation, group, or individual. In addition to talking to a great number of those involved in the Program, we observed classes and had a brief opportunity to experience the Program and its milieu.

Notes Accompanying Section I

[1]The terms Consortium and Program are used interchangeably throughout.

[2]Grant proposal narrative, Bilingual Human Services Educational Consortium, pp. 10-11.

[3]Ibid., pp. 12-13.

[4]While this report is concerned principally with the Program's third year, comparisons will be made with data collected in the first two years when possible.

[5]James Gallagher, Final Evaluation of the Bilingual Bicultural Human Services Training Consortium, July 1976 - June 1977, Bangor Communtiy College of the University of Maine at Orono, 1977, p. 4.

II. THE PROGRAM FROM THE STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVE

A great deal of data was collected from students. The use of two questionnaires--at the beginning and at the end of the academic year--allows us to see change in a number of student attitudes about the Franco-American Program and about themselves. In comparing such pre- and post-test measures we have to be careful not to assume causality. For example, if we hypothesize that students' self-confidence will be increased through Program participation and we observe a change in responses to questions about self-confidence, we cannot conclude that the Program caused these changes in the absence of a matched control group who did not participate in the Program. It is important to bear this in mind, but on the other hand, the Program was a major factor in students' lives throughout the academic year. Studying, attending classes, and completing practicum placements constituted a full-time job--although many students also had "full-time" duties at places of employment and/or at home. Because the Program absorbed large amounts of time and effort, and because it was a sharp change from their prior activities, it is very likely that attitude changes observed on the questionnaires resulted at least in part from Program participation. We can also look at changes in assessment of the Program itself to see how students' expectations and early impressions differed from their experiences.

Some change between pre- and post-Program responses could be expected even if no real change occurred because any person's responses are likely to fluctuate slightly from day to day. Thus we cannot attribute meaning to very slight changes. Also, in looking at changes between questionnaires we have to limit our analysis to students who completed both the fall and spring forms. It would be misleading to compare group mean scores from the two questionnaires using all responses because the means would be based on different groups, and differences between means would not necessarily indicate actual change. However,

when we look at variables other than change scores we will use all available responses.

Student Characteristics

The fall questionnaire obtained this profile of students entering the Program:

- 78% of the students were born in Maine, 14% in Canada
- 95% of the students had lived in Maine at least 5 years.
- A large majority of students were female (88%)
- The average age of students was 38; only 6% were 55 or older.
- Three-quarters of the students had children; one-quarter had 4 or more children.
- About one-half of the students were married, one-quarter divorced or separated, and one-quarter either widowed or never married.
- About 40% were employed while enrolled as students. These 40% were split about equally between full- and part-time workers.
- Two-thirds of the students were in families whose total income for 1976 was less than $10,000; only 11% had incomes of $15,000 or more.
- 62% preferred using French instead of English "sometimes, 11% "often."

This profile indicates that students were drawn from the target population of Maine Franco-Americans, out of school for a number of years, unemployed or underemployed. We did not ask for pre-Program educational levels, but that information was collected by Program staff. A majority of the students had completed high school or a high school equivalency, including some with additional college or vocational school. Also included in the student body, however, were people who had never gone to high school.

Students who entered but did not graduate from the Program differ little from those who completed it.[1] The proportion of students graduating was virtually independent of sex, age, number of children, employment during the school year, and employment prior to the Program. The data suggest, however, that those who did not graduate were disproportionately divorced, separated, or widowed or from

---

[1]Footnotes will be found at the end of the section.

families with incomes of less than $5,000. Non-graduates and graduates did not differ significantly in responding to questions about how often and in what settings they used the French language. This suggests that non-graduates were not those who were least comfortable with English. Nor did non-graduates exhibit less self-confidence or lower feelings of self-esteem. On the fall questionnaire those who eventually did not graduate were no different from other students in their assessment of how the program was a strain on them; they were equally satisfied with the Program at that point in time, and equal proportions of the two groups said they expected to complete the program.

The variables considered here, then, fail to distinguish, shortly after matriculation, students who did and did not complete the one-year course. While these variables are not exhaustive, they do cover a range of socio-economic and psychological characteristics. This comparison suggests that site coordinators could probably not have reduced attrition by more careful screening of applicants.

Use of the French Language

Six questions were asked on both fall and spring questionnaires concerning the students' use of French. No significant differences[2] were observed between students' fall and spring responses. This is not entirely unexpected. The Program's aim is to develop English language skills and provide vocational training to people who already possess bilingual abilities, not to teach French to monolinguals. One would expect the use of French to change for some individuals. Those who entered the program very unsure of their English abilities might increasingly use English as they gained proficiency in it. Those who spoke little French in the fall--who were "rusty"--might feel more at ease using French by the spring. For most students, however, there was no hypothesized direction of change.

Students indicated the extent of their French speaking by checking that a statement applied to them "never", "sometimes", or "often". By computing mean

responses (assigning a value of 1 to never, 3 to sometimes, and 5 to often) we can rank order the statements to see in which situations students are most likely to use French. Arranged from highest to lowest mean scores (most often to least often), the six statements are:

(1) I feel comfortable talking in French outside the home.

(2) French is used in my life outside the home.

(3) French is used in my home

(4) I believe French has been useful to me in obtaining jobs.

(5) I prefer using French instead of English.

(6) French communicates my thoughts better than English.

Six other questions, interspersed throughout the questionnaire, tried to ascertain attitudes toward the French language, the Franco-American culture, and bilingual education. We might hypothesize that on these variables students would change in the direction of feeling more pride in their language and culture and a stronger feeling of the importance of French. A comparison of fall and spring responses, however, shows no significant differences.[3] Again we can order the statements to show which the students agreed with most often. (Scores here range from 1 for strongly agree to 4 for strongly disagree.) Ranked from most to least student agreement the statements are:

(1) My Franco-American heritage is important to me.

(2) I see value for my children and grandchildren (or the younger generation of Franco-Americans) in learning and speaking French.

(3) I would like to get a job using my bilingual skills.

(4) Bilingual classes are effective in helping me learn.

(5) The French I speak is as good as that spoken in Canada.

(6) The French I speak is as good as that spoken in France.

Students' Self-Perceptions

Questions about self-perceptions and role-perceptions included eight questions asking for students' agreement or disagreement with statements about men and women. On these items students showed little change from fall to spring. Almost all disagreed with the statements that men are more intelligent or are better workers than women; but over half agreed that women are more compassionate than men. Almost all disagreed with "Woman's place is in the home," but fewer disagreed with "There is such a thing as men's and women's work." This last opinion showed the greatest shift between fall and spring. In the fall half the students believed that there is men's and women's work; in the spring only one-third agreed.

The questions which showed the most dramatic changes were those about the students' self-confidence and images of themselves. All eight items showed significant[4] changes in the expected direction of increased self-confidence or self-worth. Four of the eight were highly significant ($p. < .01$). Table I shows, for each of the eight statements, the proportion of students whose spring response indicated more often experiencing each feeling, the proportion indicating less often, and the proportion whose answers did not change. Bear in mind that students were not asked how they had changed; they were asked at both times whether each statement fit their feelings "very often", "fairly often", "once in a while", or "almost never". Table I is derived from a comparison of each individual's two responses.

The first five statements in Table I express negative self-assessments. On all these the spring responses show one-fifth to one-third of the students moving in the direction of less often experiencing that feeling, and less than one-fifth moving in the more often direction. The last three statements are positive self-assessments, and as hypothesized, more students (29% to 37%) moved towards more often feeling each way than moved toward less often (9% to 18%). The statistical significance of these changes points out one of the Program's greatest strengths.

TABLE I

Direction of Change in Responses from Beginning (fall) to End (spring) of Human Services Program [1]

How often.....	More Often	No Change	Less Often
do you feel that there is nothing you can do well?	11%	56%	33%
do you worry about whether people like to be with you?	18%	56%	26%
do you dislike yourself?	12%	60%	28%
do you think you are a worthless individual?	9%	68%	23%
do you feel so discouraged with yourself that you wonder whether anything is worthwhile?	12%	67%	21%
do you have the feeling that you can do everything well?	37%	45%	18%
do you feel comfortable when starting a conversation with people whom you don't know?	35%	52%	13%
do you feel that you are a successful person?	29%	62%	9%

(Number of students responding ranges from 80 - 83.)

[1] Students were asked at both the beginning and end of the program whether they experienced these feelings "very often," "fairly often," "once in a while," or "almost never."

English Language Training

The spring questionnaires asked students to assess the Program's effectiveness in English language training, increased English ability being a major focus of the curriculum. Almost four-fifths (77%) of the students replied that their English abilities were increased. And only 9% said that language might be a serious problem in working in the human services field. In light of these responses it is surprising, then, that a majority of students (62%) would have liked still more time spent on developing their English abilities.

About half of the students had no suggestions for improving the English component of the Program. Just over one-fifth suggested more time spent on English; specifically they recommended two full semester courses. About one-eighth suggested more emphasis on English writing skills--composition, grammar and sentence structure. Smaller numbers noted needs for more screening to identify and help students with greatest English dificiencies, more vocabulary work, and help in reading comprehension or note taking. While the majority seemed to express a need for more writing skills, several also stated a need for improvement in public speaking skills.

Vocational Preparation, Job Plans

Students seem to have started the program with high--perhaps unrealistically high--expectations of vocational preparation they would receive. At the beginning of the Program 81% agreed (13% "Strongly agreed," 68% "agreed") that "After I finish this program employers will treat me as a trained para-professional." By spring only 63% agreed with the statement (11% strongly, 52% simply), a significant number having moved toward disagreement.[5] The change in a second, related variable was less strong[6] but in a similar direction: in the spring students were more likely to disagree that "In my employment, after finishing this program, I expect to earn more than minimum wage."

Slightly fewer also responded in the spring that they would be "well prepared" to get a job with a human service agency after completing the Program. In the spring students more cautiously responded that they would be "somewhat prepared."[7] While they were less certain that the Program would give them the credentials to get a professional job, students were sure that they had gained ability. At the beginning of the Program, 32% said they felt they were "very capable" of helping people at that point in time. At the end of the year, 58% felt "very capable."

There was no significant change in agreement with the statement "I would like to get a job using my bilingual skills." On the spring questionnaire 39% agreed strongly with this and 55% agreed. Many students, however, were not planning to get jobs in human services upon Program completion: 43% planned to look for a job, 43% were undecided, and 14% did not plan to seek a human services job. Over half (54%) the students, however, planned to continue college work after finishing the one-year certificate.

It appears that the students learned during the year that they had expected too much of a one-year certificate as a credential. They realized that they had gained employment skills, but that more college work would more likely lead to the jobs they wanted. Thus, the Program is producing trained workers, but its impact will be somewhat deferred until students complete further learning and then enter the labor force.

Program Evaluation

At the end of the academic year students expressed great enthusiasm for the Program: 92% would enroll again; 96% would recommend it to a friend; 64% were "completely satisfied" with the Program, and 84% would like to be able to continue in a second year of a University bilingual program.

Despite these laudatory responses, on some points students lowered their evaluation of the program between fall and spring. For example, spring question-

naires showed significant shifts toward disagreement with two statements, and a less significant trend toward disagreement with a third:[8]

(1) The faculty has helped me increase my abilities to do the work.

(2) The program has helped my improve my job skills.

(3) The program will help me achieve my personal goals.

At no time, however, did students disagree with these statements. On the spring questionnaire 24% strongly agreed with the first, 30% with the second, and 37% with the third. The movement toward disagreement, then, can not be interpreted as a negative assessment though it is interesting. Perhaps--as we conjectured with responses about vocational preparation--students started with unrealistic expectations. Another possible explanation is that at the end of the year students' increased feelings of self-confidence led them to give less credit to others (especially impersonal others such as "the faculty" and "the program") and to give themselves more credit for their successes and achievements.

Other questions about the Program and curriculum asked only in the spring reveal further satisfaction. As Table II indicates, students were not displeased with grading procedures nor with the staff, and they found both classroom work and practicum to be useful learning experiences, rating the classwork slightly more favorably. In a separate question 30% of the students said that the classwork was more valuable; 8% said they found the practicum more valuable, and 61% rated them equally valuable.

Table II

Students' Evaluation of Franco-American Program

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The classwork grading procedures were fair.	25%	61%	13%	0%
The project staff were concerned about me.	37%	56%	6%	1%
My practicum was a useful learning experience.	50%	43%	5%	2%
The classroom work was a useful learning experience.	61%	37%	2%	0%

A number of students (39%) felt that they "needed more help (guidance, counseling, or tutoring) to do the work well." These students differ from the others in several ways.[9] First, they tended to be older. Whether or not a student needed more help was not related, however, to the number of children in the student's family, whether or not the student was employed, or family income.

Needing more help was associated with low feelings of self-confidence, especially with feeling "there is nothing you can do well" and seldom feeling "that you are a successful person." Needing help was also marginally associated with feeling "so discouraged...that you wonder whether anything is worthwhile." Students who believed they needed more help also reported feeling less capable to help people and less well prepared to get a job in a human service agency.

In addition students needing more help were significantly more likely to speak French. They use French more both at home and outside the home. French communicates their thoughts better, and they prefer using French. Students who believed they needed even more help, then, include older, less confident, Francophones. This finding points out the importance of support services and developmental education in enabling non-traditional students to complete post-secondary work.

It is obvious that the program was much more demanding than students had anticipated. Students were given a list of ways in which the program might be a strain on them, both in the fall and spring. Substantially higher percentages indicated each kind of strain, except financial, in the spring. This exception is reasonable because the financial costs of the program could be known in advance of the entire year, while other aspects were less predicatable.

Table III

Ways in which the Franco-American Program Put Students Under Strain, as reported at the Beginning and End of Year

	Fall	Spring
Financially	27%	26%
Physically	14%	30%
Emotionally	18%	30%
Family Life	20%	44%
Free Time	30%	54%
No Strain	26%	10%

It isn't surprising, then, that the most frequent response as to how the Program differed from their expectations was that it was more difficult. Almost one-third of the students volunteered this opinion on an open-ended question. Another 16% said the Program was more interesting than anticipated. No other single response was given by more than a few students.

Almost half (49%) of the students considered self-confidence and personal growth to be the greatest benefits of Program participation. Learning about the elderly and services for the elderly, and generally broadening knowledge and abilities were cited as most beneficial by 17% and 15% respectively. About one-tenth considered increased language abilities to be their most important gain. Students' suggestions for changing the program are consistent with

other responses reported here:

(1) 14% would like to see the program extended to a two-year course, both to lighten the load on students and to allow for more in-depth study.

(2) 11% believe the practicum should be lengthened, spreading the hours out over a longer period of time, or advocate having several practicum placements so students can become acquainted with several agencies.

(3) Another 8% believe there should be fewer demands on students, especially in the second semester. They recommend reducing the practicum requirement or reducing course work during the practicum placement.

(4) 6% suggest more instruction in English.

(5) 35% had no changes to recommend.

Summary

Clearly the Franco-American Human Services Program challenged students. And because they were helped to meet the challenges of a demanding course they gained greatly in self-confidence and feelings of self-worth. They also made significant gains in using the English language and in skills and knowledge needed in the human services field. Somc students were disappointed to learn the apparent limits of job potential for a one-year certificate holder, but on balance they were very glad to have participated and felt strongly that their involvement was worthwhile.

Notes Accompanying Section II

[1]Fall questionnaires were completed by 98% of those who later graduated and by 79% of those who did not. Because the number of non-graduates responding in the spring was smaller, comparisons between the two groups are based only on the fall questionnaire. Differences between graduates and non-graduates are reported when the chi-square statistic is significant at .10 or less.

[2]As measured by the two-tailed significance of the Sign Test and the Wilcoxin Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test. These tests are used when comparing scores of one group of respondents on a variable measured at two points in time. The sign test is based on the direction of change only, the Wilcoxin test on direction and magnitude.

[3]As measured by the one-tailed Sign and Wilcoxin Tests.

[4]As measured by the one-tailed Wilcoxin Test, $p < .10$. Six of the eight are significant when the Sign Test is used.

[5]Two-tailed p : Sign Test, .021; Wilcoxin Test, .016.

[6]Two-tailed p : Sign Test, .165; Wilcoxin Test, .074.

[7]Fall responses: well prepared 50%, somewhat prepared 33%. Spring responses: well prepared 42%, somewhat prepared 43%.

[8]Two-tailed p values for the three statements: Sign Test .015, .010, .134; Wilcoxin Test .015, .020, .074.

[9]Significance is determined here by the Mann-Whitney U. All differences cited are significant at .05 or less (two-tailed p). Differences considered marginally significant are significant at .10.

III. THE PROGRAM FROM THE FACULTY PERSPECTIVE

Responses to the faculty questionnaires indicate a high level of satisfaction with most aspects of the Program. Responses were similar across the five sites, so are presented here only for the total group.

Students

The faculty were almost unanimous (98%) in replying that they felt comfortable working with adult Franco-American students. Observations during the site visits strongly support this response. Faculty appeared to be--and said they were--not only at ease, but enjoying the opportunity to work with adult, bilingual students. Faculty were well selected from this standpoint--they established excellent inter-relationships with the students upon which to build their instructional approach.

About two-thirds of the faculty found the "Students' prior academic preparation adequate to meet the demands of the Program." Problems cited were in use of English as a written language and in study skills such as notetaking and outlining.

The faculty did feel, however, that students were receiving much of the help they needed. Support services such as counseling were rated "very effective" by 78%. None of the faculty considered support services to be "ineffective."

There was no concensus among faculty as to whether students in a one-year bilingual program should be put in classes with students in regular two- and four-year programs. Thirty-nine percent favor such mixing; 46% oppose it, and 15% were undecided or didn't respond. On this issue, responses of the 1977-78 faculty differed substantially from faculty responses in 1976. At that time 60% favored mixing of Program and non-Program students.[1]

---

[1]Footnotes will be found at the end of the section.

Bilingual Instruction

Over half of the faculty (56%) said the bilingual instructional approach was "very effective." However, use of French in the classroom was "often" for only 17% of the faculty, and French was never used in the classroom by 24%. About half (49%) of the faculty indicated that they were bilingual, but even monolingual instructors sometimes found it useful to have students use French and translate for each other.

Faculty this year were much more satisfied with the availability of bilingual classroom materials than were the 1976 faculty. In 1976 only 13% felt there were "adequate" bilingual materials available in contrast to 49% this year. The materials provided by the Bilingual Instructional Materials Project were used by 46%, though under half of those using them considered the materials "very useful." We have no way of knowing whether these materials were responsible for the increased proportion who felt adequate materials were available, but the difference is notable.

It appears that faculty members are neither highly pleased nor displeased with the bilingual instructional approach. One might suspect that many faculty see this as an issue of low salience. Certainly for the 24% who never use French in the classroom the availability of bilingual materials is not important and the effectiveness of bilingual instruction is not a matter of personal concern.[2] It is likely that a number of instructors have never even given much thought to the Program's use of bilingual instruction but have seen that as the realm of the site coordinator and the instructor of Bilingual Communications. Responses to this series of questions might be interpreted, then, as showing uncertainty about the effectiveness--or the value--of bilingual instruction in most subject areas. Our experience in site visits was that monolingual instructors said it would be nice to be bilingual, but that they did not feel that their inability

to speak French affected their ability to teach in this program.

Curriculum

In designing the curriculum for a post-secondary vocational training course educators strive to teach an appropriate blend of theoretical or abstract material and practical skills. The Franco-American Human Services Program offered students both classroom and practicum experiences. This approach is not unusual, but nevertheless it is always difficult to tell whether the classes and practicum will indeed mesh to give the student the hoped for combination of knowledge and skills. From the perspective of the faculty, the Program has succeeded in this goal. Seventy-one percent responded that the combination of classroom courses and practicum experience teach both theory and practice "very well," 17% believed this was accomplished "fairly well," and the remaining 11% didn't know or didn't respond. None considered the curriculum worked "poorly" in this regard.

Faculty were also asked "How well is the curriculum as a whole designed to meet the program's objective of preparing bilingual adults for paraprofessional jobs in human service agencies?" To this question 61% answered "very well," 37% "fairly well," and none "poorly."

The difference in responses to these two questions is not large, but is thought provoking: 61% feel the curriculum is well designed to train bilingual paraprofessionals; 71% believe the practicum and classes combine well to teach theory and practice. We can only speculate as to what the difference in responses signifies. Perhaps faculty members percieve (71%) that the curriculum's content is being conveyed (both in its theoretical and practical dimensions), but are slightly less sure (61%) that the curriculum content is precisely what is needed to train bilingual human service paraprofessionals.

Less than one in five instructors (17%) had any difficulty "establishing appropriate procedures for evaluation student performance." This further supports evidence that faculty were well selected and that they did feel at

ease with the student population, the curriculum, and the combination of academic and vocational education. Educators less comfortable in the Program and less flexible in their approaches to education might be expected to have difficulty evaluating non-traditional students in a non-traditional University course.

University Setting

The faculty seem to feel almost no doubt that the Program was appropriately placed in the University; 88% think it "belongs in a university setting." The faculty/staff questionnaire used in 1976 showed virtually identical results on this item. Slightly fewer of the instructors, but still a large majority (83%) "think the academic standards of this program were sufficient to justify the awarding of college credits."

The faculty are much less certain, however, that the Program is well received by the University community. None replied that non-Program faculty and students had negative feelings, but only 56% considered attitudes toward the Program to be positive. Perhaps there is no reason to expect--or desire--other students and faculty to have positive, rather than neutral or no, impressions of the Program. But all five sites were located at relatively small campuses where an unusual program and older, bilingual students could not go unnoticed. Thus, "neutral" attitudes are probably not an indication that many are unaware of the Program, but may mean that is was not really accepted as a part of the campus--a benign neglect.

The 1978 faculty are less favorable to the University's offering bilingual programs in other fields than was the 1976 faculty. This year 63% favor the idea, in contrast to 92% in 1976. Two possible reasons for this difference come to mind. Now that the Program has been offered for three years, faculty may feel that the need for University bilingual programs has been met, at least for the time being, or that bilingual education need not be offered in field-specific programs. Also, the definition of the Program has broadened since the first

year of operation. In 1976 faculty were replying that bilingual programs should be offered in fields other than gerontology, not necessarily outside the wider field of human services.

Program Outcomes

In most respects faculty are almost unanimous in agreeing that the Program has effected its goals.

- 84% considered the program "very effective" in developing human services job skills.
- 85% considered the program "very effective" in developing interpersonal skills.
- 90% thought graduates would be prepared for paraprofessional jobs.
- 88% felt students had gained confidence in their abilities to get jobs.
- 90% said that "considering everything," the program is "very valuable."

In sharp contrast to these data only 15% considered the program "very effective" in developing students' bilingual language skills. Only 7% considered the Program "not very effective" in language development, and the majority considered it "somewhat effective" or didn't reply. These responses are not ostensibly a condemnation of the Program's bilingual training, but clearly the faculty are much less sure of its outcomes in this area.

Program Administration

There seem to be no complaints from faculty members about Program administration. All forty-one respondents said they would "like to work with similar programs in the future;" in fact, about half had worked with this program before the semester in which they responded. About nine-tenths felt they had an opportunity to participate in decisions about curriculum and instruction, and 85% received enough information about the Program when they became involved. This last response is a substantial increase over the 64% of the 1976 faculty who thought they received adequate information. This is an important change, but

also is to be expected because the Program has now operated for three years and is much more of a known entity.

Summary

On the whole the faculty express strong support of the Franco-American Program. They feel good about working in the Program and are confident that outcomes are positive. Some instructors do have doubts, however, about the effectiveness of bilingual instruction, bilingual curricula materials, and bilingual skill development. They also are not certain of the University's receptiveness to the Program.

Notes Accompanying Section III

[1]The 1976 question wording was slightly different, referring only to integrating with students in two-year programs. The reader should also bear in mind when interpreting any differences between the 1976 and 1978 data that in 1976, twenty-five persons completed questionnaires including faculty, non-teaching program staff, and Advisory Board members at the three sites then operating. The 1978 questionnaire was distributed only to faculty and site coordinators. No written questionnaire was sent to faculty in 1977.

[2]Faculty are highly concerned with students' bilingual development in that students' difficulties with English affects monolingual English instruction. "Bilingual instruction", however, usually refers to use of both languages in the classroom, and especially to use of French in classes other than Bilingual Communication.

IV. THE PROGRAM FROM THE PRACTICUM SUPERVISORS' PERSPECTIVE

Practicum supervisors at the five sites seem to hold many common views of the Program. On many questions eliciting yes/no or agree/disagree answers 80% or more of the supervisors responded in the same manner, and on questions with three or more response categories often 60% or more selected the same response. This near unanimity of opinions in every case expresses satisfaction with the supervisors' involvement in the Program.

Positive evaluations from the supervisors are not surprising to the extent that they were engaging in a self evaluation:[1] the practicum placements depended heavily on supervisors for definition of the students' tasks and the ground rules of student interaction with clients and staff. It is also possible that the questions asked were not the right ones to ferret out any negative evaluations held by supervisors. Or perhaps supervisors were being kind, giving the answer they knew would please other Program participants, or perceived that a negative reply could not lead to a change (because the Program was ending) and was futile. And in any survey where less than 100% response is obtained, one has to ask how respondents differ from non-respondents. In a program evaluation one distinct possibility is that only those most favorable to the program will respond.[2] The 56% rate of response from practicum supervisors is respectable, but does leave open the question of non-response bias.

Even when one considers all these potentially biasing factors, it is clear that practicum supervisors have highly favorable views of the Program. Responses to one question reflect this overall satisfaction, with 70% being "very satisfied."

---

[1]Footnotes will be found at the end of this section.

"Overall, how satisfied with this program are you?"

Very satisfied	70%
Somewhat satisfied	24
Somewhat dissatisfied	6
Very dissatisfied	0
Total	100%

More specific questions, however, provide more useful information. One area of concern in assessing the practicum placements was the preparation before the placement, of both supervisor and student. Nine-tenths of the supervisors (91%) believed that they "were given enough information about the program to understand how to make the practicum most beneficial to both you and the student." Almost as many (82%) were satisfied with the preparation students received before placement.[3] Those who were not satisfied with student preparation included a few who felt students did not know what to expect in a placement or did not know how to fit into an agency, as well as a few who felt students lacked knowledge in human services. In response to an open-ended question about how the Program could be improved, 15% of supervisors noted a need for more preliminary information or a better understanding of the practicum.

It appears that a large majority of practicum placements proceeded smoothly and benefitted both the student and the agency. Almost three-quarters (71%) of the supervisors rated the practicum as being equally beneficial to student and agency; 23% considered that it was more beneficial to the student, and 6% stated it was not very beneficial to either. While it is to be hoped that agencies find practicum placements helpful, the chief purpose of the placement is to further the students' training. If an agency really attempts to provide training during a practicum rather than seeing a student as free low-skill help, then some agency benefits are indirect and not immediate: agency staff develop their own skills and focus their thinking during the process of teaching; the

quality of human service workers in the area is raised by the addition of trained personnel to the labor force. But the cost of a placement to an agency--in staff time for training and supervision--may be considerable. Given that the benefits are indirect and the costs direct, it is to be expected that agencies see students as receiving greater benefits.

Each student began the practicum with a set of competencies to achieve. Some competencies were established in the curriculum and varied by the type of agency placement (e.g. nursing home, hospital). In addition, students, staff, and supervisors jointly set goals for the practicum. The supervisor and site coordinator each evaluated the students' learning at the end of the placement. Nine-tenths (91%) of the supervisors responded that students placed with them achieved the learning objectives outlined for the practicum. The same proportion were satisfied with the procedure for evaluating student performance.

On the whole, supervisors (84%) thought that classroom and practicum learning fit together well to teach theory and practice. This is slightly higher than the proportion of faculty (71%) who saw the two aspects working well together. Supervisors indicate that students have gained considerably from the practicum and the Program. When asked to react to five statements about student outcomes:

> 81% agree that graduates are prepared for paraprofessional level jobs,
>
> 94% agree that students' job skills increased markedly through the practicum period,
>
> 91% agree that the Program has increased students' confidence in their abilities to obtain jobs,
>
> 78% agree that graduates will be able to compete for jobs paying more than minimum wage, and
>
> 84% agree that students exhibited a high degree of self-confidence in their practicum work.

Another indication that students were valuable additions to the agencies, and that the Program is meeting a need in the human service labor market, is that 91% of the supervisors would hire a program graduate if they had an opening. And it is encouraging that the same proportion believe there are positions available in Maine for graduates. In contrast, in 1976 only 64% of responding supervisors believed jobs were available.

Most placements gave students experience in bilingual service delivery; 82% of supervisors say students had an opportunity to speak French in dealing with clients or patients. But in some cases the students' use of French seems to have been only marginal. The students' bilingual abilities were "not very useful" according to about one-quarter of the supervisors, and "somewhat useful" in the view of one-fifth. The remaining six-tenths considered bilingualism "very useful." About four-fifths (79%) of the supervisors would prefer a bilingual person when choosing between two otherwise equal job applicants. It is difficult to compare this to the fact that in 1976 91% of supervisors completing the questionnaire said they would prefer bilingual applicants. In the two intervening years the program has expanded to two additional parts of Maine and has expanded from its gerontology focus to human services in general. Thus, there have been changes in the kinds and locations of agencies serving as practicum placements. What would be useful to know is whether agencies would answer this question differently before and after involvement in the Program. However, lacking that information, we can say that most practicum agencies see value in hiring bilingual staff.

Finally, students apparently worked effectively with both agency staff and clients. Over 90% of the supervisors said they and their staffs were comfortable working with Program students. About half assessed the students' ability to work with clients as "excellent" and another 38% as "good."

Summary

In summary, it is clear that practicum supervisors found the Franco-American Human Services Program worthwhile. Positive evaluations of the practicum extended to all areas of their involvement: preparation, achievement of competencies, the students' interaction with staff and clients, and recognition of the need for bilingual paraprofessionals. Certainly these agencies are not a random cross-section of human service deliverers in the areas surrounding the five sites. They were carefully selected on criteria such as attitudes toward training and the presence of French-speaking clients. Accordingly we can not generalize their positive reaction to bilingual paraprofessionals to all agencies. Nevertheless, these agencies are likely to be leaders, and their enthusiasm speaks well for the Program.

Notes Accompanying Section IV

[1]This is true of all participant groups: supervisors, faculty, and students. Members of each group invested time and energy in the Program, and the Program's success depended on their efforts. If they perceived that their actions did affect the Program's success, participants would tend to view the Program favorably, taking pride in their role in it. This does not mean that everyone should hypothetically express total satisfaction. Each participant was also dependent on the input of all others, any individual's ability to directly affect the Program being small.

[2]All these caveats, of course, apply to the data from all the questionnaires employed. They are enumerated here because the unusual unanimity of responses raises the question, "Why?" The last cited explanation, non-response bias, is a negligible problem with the faculty and student questionnaires which attained much higher rates of response.

[3]Each supervisor had only a limited view of the Program and could respond only in terms of his/her experiences with one or a few students and perhaps slight informal feedback from other supervisors. It may have been difficult for any supervisor to know whether his/her experiences and assigned students were typical.

V. SITE VISIT OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The site visits were a pleasant and intellectually stimulating experience for the evaluators. Enthusiasm for the Program was high at all sites with all participants eager to share their perceptions of this unusual higher education course.

Major observations and recommendations of the site visit team are presented here in four categories:

(1) providing access to the University for non-traditional students,

(2) Program atmosphere,

(3) vocational training, and

(4) academic considerations.

Providing Access to the University for non-traditional students

1. The site coordinators' position is essential to the program's success.

We strongly feel that the low rate of student attrition and the high level of student academic success in the Program are closely tied to the site coordinators' efforts. Adult students who have not been in school for a number of years, who have English language difficulties, and who may feel uncomfortable in a University setting, need a great deal of support--counseling, tutoring, personal concern--to succeed in college. It is essential that such students have one person to whom they can turn rather than just that they have access (as every student does) to a variety of University services. Left on their own to find the support services they need, adult or non-traditional students will often become "lost" in the University system.

2. Stipends are essential in recruiting non-traditional students and in enabling them to remain enrolled.

Many students in the Program could not qualify for forms of financial aid generally available to students. Nevertheless they could not have become involved

without financial assistance to replace income forgone by participating in the Program or to alleviate the extra strain placed on family budgets by the costs of tuition, books, transportation, and possibly child care. For example, a number of students have children currently or soon to be enrolled in higher education. These parents would not themselves return to school if doing so jeopardized the family's ability to send their children to school.

3. The ability of students to stay in the Program was largely a function of the students' group cohesion.

Site coordinators and peer counselors invested energy in building as esprit de corps among the students. The return on this investment was excellent. Once the students developed a group identity they provided many support services for each other. This served both to free staff time for other duties and to reinforce the students' feelings of competence and self-reliance.

4. More emphasis on developmental education would enable students to progress further, or more easily, in academic work.

The students in the Program varied enormously in prior educational levels and in language competence. Some lacked study and writing skills, others had skills but needed to sharpen them, and others were well-prepared. The most prevalent problem--and it was a problem for a sizeable number of students--was in English writing skills. Most students also needed assistance in identifying the important points in texts and in note taking. Any program for a similar student population should make a concerted and on-going effort to identify the need for, and to provide, developmental education. A short series of study skill workshops is useful, and integrating developmental study into each course can be effective, but unless the effort is planned and coordinated there will be serious gaps in the developmental education provided.

Students compensate for the lack of developmental work by devoting great time and energy to studying. Faculty compensate by spending time in and out of class helping students learn to study. But frustrations of both faculty and students would be reduced, and faculty could cover more substantive material, if these compensating techniques were not necessary.

5. University administrators were for the most part supportive of the Consortium, but the Program was not fully accepted as an integral part of each campus.

On each campus which served as an instructional site for the Consortium, a University administrator had oversight. Site coordinators were responsible to these administrators as well as to the Consortium Director. The administrators were members of the Consortium's Advisory Board. Despite their high praise for the Program and expressions of interest in it, the administrators did not become highly involved. There are several possible reasons for this lack of involvement:

1. The Program "belonged" to Bangor Community College, not to each campus.

2. The Program was unlike all other campus activities and administrators felt uncomfortable with it.

3. Administrators perceived it was unlikely the Program would continue after the grant period, so didn't feel it warranted great involvement on their part.

4. Administrators saw that the site coordinators and Program Director were running the Program well so believed there was no need for them to be involved.

Whatever the reason for its existence, this lack of involvement resulted in the Program's being a "step-child" at each campus. Because the Program was not affiliated with any campus department or college, the responsibility for merging it into the mainstream of the campus fell mostly on the site coordinator. Site coordinators were not necessarily aware of or familiar with all campus services

and resources and had not fully established linkages with campus personnel. Consequently the coordinators tried to provide many services personally rather than being able to effectively use existing resources. The need for developmental education cited above is one area in which existing University departments could have provided much needed help.

University personnel had no way to know of the Program's needs, and site coordinators had little opportunity to know where to seek help. We conclude that if inter-institutional consortia are to be truly effective and efficient, each campus must exhibit a strong commitment and accept responsibility for the effort's success or failure.

Program Atmosphere

1. Students, faculty, site coordinators, and practicum supervisors all express great enthusiasm for the program at every site.

The level of enthusiasm at every site visited was infectious. The program obviously has succeeded in "turning on" to higher education students who previously had very little or no expectation of going back to school.

2. Students feel the workload was heavy but are very pleased with their personal growth.

At every site we heard from students that their lives have been changed and their horizons broadened by the Program.

3. Inter-personal communications problems and differences in educational philosophy among Program administrators and staff have caused some friction and loss of efficiency, but have not adversely affected students or the Program's overall effectiveness.

Vocational Training

1. Many students believe that the Program gave them unrealistic expectations of employability.

It is too early to ascertain how accurate students are in their perception that few jobs are open to graduates of a one-year certificate course. And students, faculty, and practicum supervisors all agree that students have gained skills in the human services area. Nevertheless, any vocational program should be careful not to lead students to believe they will be able to compete for jobs which in fact require credentials not provided by the program.

2. Some practicum placements received insufficient involvement from the site coordinator.

The practicum experience is an important component of the Program's vocational training, giving students an opportunity to apply what they learn in class and the opportunity to develop inter-personal skills needed to work with clients/service receivers and co-workers/service providers. The practicum can, however, be a frustrating experience for the student and the practicum agency if both are not fully aware of their respective roles and working to make the experience mutually beneficial. Establishing and nurturing this student-agency relationship requires a great deal of effort by the site coordinator in carefully matching students to agency placements, in ensuring that agency supervisors understand the practicum's educational goals, and in monitoring student and agency satisfaction with the placement.

All site coordinators understand the importance of their involvement in practicum placements, but they have not found time to make the necessary number of contacts during the practicums. Many placements were highly successful, but we heard some discontent from students and supervisors who thought that problems in placements were allowed to develop too long before they were addressed.

3. The Program could have played a much more aggressive,positive role in placing graduates in jobs.

It is difficult to suggest that already overworked site coordinators should have taken on added tasks. On the other hand, it seems logical that a vocational

training program should be active in placing graduates. Perhaps placement services could be provided by existing campus career planning and placement offices in conjunction with site coordinators.

Placement efforts varied from site to site. Students were given help in writing resumés. All student resumés were distributed to human service agencies in at least one area. Workshops coached students in job interview behavior. And some site coordinators routinely inquire about developing jobs for students at their practicum placements. But at no site was there an emphasis on placement. This is especially unfortunate when you consider that the students were selected because they were unemployed or underemployed; they could be expected to need help in locating and pursuing appropriate openings.

4. Human service agencies--especially nursing homes--show a need for trained bilingual staff. There is some evidence that these agencies are beginning to recognize this need and to recruit staff accordingly.

It is difficult to believe--but apparent from our site visits--that some hospitals, nursing homes, and other human service providers in areas with large French-speaking populations are often without any bilingual staff or rely on bilingual clerical and maintenance staff to translate for service delivery staff. Several practicum placement supervisors expressed appreciation of the value of the students' bilingualism and indicated that the Program was instrumental in their recognition of the need for trained bilingual staff. (This observation does not apply to the Fort Kent area where a majority of the population speaks French. There it would be rare for an agency not to have bilingual staff.)

5. Most agencies which have served as practicum placements have been very favorably impressed with the Program and its students.

Practicum supervisors who had not had students placed in their agencies before were generally pleasantly surprised by the calibre of the student. Supervisors

who had supervised students from other programs as well as from the Consortium, generally found that the adult Franco-American student exhibited greater maturity, motivation, and responsibility.

Academic Considerations

1. Selection of faculty interested in and skilled at teaching adults has been a critical factor in the Program's success.

We were strongly impressed by the faculty members we met. Faculty stressed that their courses were not "watered down" college courses, but that academic integrity can be maintained while adapting instructional techniques to the students' needs. The faculty accepted the challenge of presenting material to persons unaccustomed to studying, reading texts, taking lecture notes, and taking tests. While the faculty deserve much credit for their positive attitudes and creativity, the students also deserve credit. Instructors enjoyed teaching the adult Franco-American students whom they characterize as highly motivated but overly grade conscious. The Program was exciting to instructors.

2. Isolating Program students during the first semester is probably a good idea, but during the second semester integration with non-Program students is advantageous.

As is evident elsewhere in this report, there is not--and has not been in earlier years--a clear consensus as to whether students in the Franco-American Program benefit more from being in self-contained classes or from integration into regular University classes. Most first semester classes have been kept self-contained. The extent of integration during the second semester has varied from site to site depending on instructors' preferences, and space, scheduling, and enrollment concerns.

It is the opinion of the site visit team that the group cohesion of Program students is fostered by having separate classes, for Program students only, during the first semester. Students need to develop self-confidence as well as a bond to the group during the first semester. Also, early in their course of study the students need faculty who are attuned to their special needs for developmental help. Later in the year (and certainly in subsequent years if Program students continue in associate or bachelors degree programs) both Program and non-Program students can benefit from exposure to each other. Traditional students might be spurred on by the enthusiasm of the older Franco-American students. And the Franco students, in turn, would be assured that they are being treated as any students, not receiving any "kid glove" treatment. Both groups might become more comfortable with people of different ages and ethnic groups.

3. Language difficulty, particularly in written English, seems to be the students' most outstanding academic problem.

To reiterate a point made above, students would benefit greatly from more help in developing English writing skills. (See above, "Providing access to the University for non-traditional students," observation 4.)

4. There is a demand for an associate degree program in human services at all sites.

While Program students wishing to continue their studies in human services probably do not constitute a large enough demand to justify extending the associate degree to all site campuses, they could provide the core of such demand. Several campuses are looking into the possibility of adding BCC's associate degree in human services to their offerings. All sites should seriously consider offering the degree, even if only for a year or two or intermittently. This should be economically feasible if the BCC degree is "borrowed" rather than a new curriculum and department developed.

VI. CONCLUSION

The preceding sections of this report have presented much data about the Bilingual Human Services Educational Consortium (the Program) and have elaborated its strengths and weaknesses as seen by the students, the faculty, practicum supervisors, and the site visit team. All participants/observers appear to agree that the Program is an unusual, exciting venture in post-secondary education for non-traditional students. It seems appropriate to now briefly turn again to the stated objectives and anticipated benefits put forth in the Program proposal to see if they have been realized. (The objectives and anticipated "significant new benefits" of the third year proposal are quoted in full on p. 2 of this report.)

Objective 1: Expanding Program Scope

The scope of the Program varied from site to site during the 1977-78 year, with students taking gerontology, human services, and developmental disabilities. At several sites two options were available for students to choose from; at others only one option was available. It seems appropriate to vary Program offerings by site, responding to local demand and not offering a narrowly defined program (such as gerontology) for too many consecutive years at one site. Objective 1 has been met.

Objective 2: Expanding Geographic Area Served

The Augusta-Waterville region was served for the first time this year by adding an instructional site at the University of Maine at Augusta (UMA). Operation of the UMA site suffered from a late notification of funding--as all sites have in their initial year--but the Program was highly successful despite this. Objective 2 has been met.

Objective 3: Providing Education to an Additional 100 Franco-Americans

Fewer than 100 students (80) completed the Program this year, but 114 received at least part of the training offered. Past experience indicates that

some of those who did not graduate will probably return to school at a later time. And it is likely that even non-graduates have enhanced their employability through Program participation. Data presented in Section II (see "Student Characteristics," p.8) indicate that students were drawn from the target group defined in the objective. Objective 3 has been met.

Objective 4: Encouraging an On-going Consortium

The Bilingual Consortium will not exist in its current form next year. Nevertheless several campuses are negotiating to offer the BCC associate degree in human services and will continue some form of bilingual program. The site coordinators have all made efforts to establish bilingual education and recruitment of non-traditional students as integral functions of each campus. It is difficult to assess the extent or effectiveness of "encouragement," but objective 4 has to some degree been met.

Benefit 1: Additional Trained Bilingual Workers

Although only about half of the Program graduates are likely to seek employment in human services in the immediate future, it is obvious that the Program has provided additional trained bilingual workers.

Benefit 2: Graduate Access to Jobs or Further Education

Practicum supervisors indicate that there are entry-level jobs available for graduates, though students have doubts of job availability. About half of the students are planning to continue University study, and evidence from earlier years shows that they are likely to succeed in regular University programs. Thus it is likely that the Program has given students access to employment and/or further education.

Benefit 3: Increased Awareness of Needs of Franco-Americans

It is not clear that the University campuses are now really commited to serving the adult Franco-American community. There is no doubt, however, that

the Consortium has increased awareness within the University and within human service agencies of the needs of Franco-Americans for educational and employment opportunities and for services in their native language.

Benefit 4: Identification and Utilization of Additional Community and Institutional Resources

The Consortium has involved a great many human service agencies in University education through practicum placements. The Program-agency relationships have been mutually beneficial, and positive feelings have resulted. The extent to which these relationships will be on-going, however, is unknown.

Benefit 5: A Model for Cost Sharing University Programs

An assessment of the Program's cost-effectiveness is beyond the scope of this evaluation. We cannot, then, comment on this Program's effectiveness as a model. Clearly, though, mechanisms for shared programs have been set up from which the University can learn for future inter-campus programs.

Benefit 6: Improved Educational Access and Environments for Non-Traditional Students

The evaluators feel that the Consortium has proved itself very effective in recruiting non-traditional students and enabling them to succeed in a supportive university environment. The University would do well to model future programs on the Consortium.

Clayton Pinette, of the site visit team, aptly summarizes his observations and the evaluation as a whole:

> From all available information given to me, I believe the Bilingual Franco-American Human Service Program has met its objectives and satisfied basic educational needs of a Franco-American group that otherwise would not have been served. It has also served to indicate to the University of Maine and Maine community the need for skill development and personal enrichment. Further, it has demonstrated to the Franco-American community that education at the college level is not just for others, but for those who are willing and ready to work.